

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 459

VT 016 543

AUTHOR Miller, Texton R.; Strickland, Cecil L.  
TITLE Teacher Attitudes and Teacher Adoption of Concepts and Practices in Programs for the Disadvantaged.  
INSTITUTION North Carolina State Univ., Raleigh. School of Education.  
REPORT NO Occup-Educ-Res-Ser-2  
PUB DATE 72  
NOTE 61p.  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Change; \*Changing Attitudes; \*Disadvantaged Youth; Followup Studies; Program Development; \*Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; \*Teaching Methods; \*Vocational Education

## ABSTRACT

This study on teacher attitudes and practices is a followup of 85 teachers who one year earlier had attended an institute on the disadvantaged. Two objectives of the questionnaire survey were: (1) to determine whether there was a difference between teachers' attitudes and their perception of their administrators' viewpoints and (2) to determine the extent to which teachers adopted a group of selected practices in a program for the disadvantaged. Included in the findings are: (1) There was a small difference between teachers' attitudes and perceptions of their principals' attitudes toward selected concepts related to school programs for disadvantaged pupils, (2) More than three-fourths of the teachers reported that they had reached at least stage IV --anticipated trial-- in adoption of the list of 36 teaching practices, (3) Few of the teachers showed interest in using personality tests to help identify their students, and (4) Slightly negative correlations were found between total scores of teachers regarding practices and years of teaching the disadvantaged, size of school, and type of school. A major conclusion is that teachers credited themselves and their principals with positive attitudes toward selected concepts related to improved school programs for disadvantaged students. (JS)

ED 067459

# **Teacher Attitudes and Adoptions of Concepts and Practices in programs for the Disadvantaged**

**Spring  
1972**



**Department of Agricultural Education**

Texton R. Miller

Cecil L. Strickland

Occupational Education Research Series No. 2

School of Education

North Carolina State University, Raleigh, 1972

VT016543

ED 067459

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-  
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-  
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY  
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-  
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TEACHER ATTITUDES AND TEACHER ADOPTION  
OF  
CONCEPTS AND PRACTICES  
IN  
PROGRAMS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

TEXTON R. MILLER  
CECIL L. STRICKLAND

SPRING, 1972

Department of Agricultural Education  
School of Education  
North Carolina State University, Raleigh

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writers wish to express their sincere appreciation to Mr. N. O. Warwick, Chief Consultant, Programs for Disadvantaged and Handicapped, State Division of Occupational Education, whose guidance and counsel were most helpful in conducting this research; to Dr. C. C. Scarborough, Head of the Department of Agricultural Education at North Carolina State University, for his constructive criticism of the instruments and to Steve Smith, graduate assistant, whose advice with the computer programming was invaluable. Appreciation also is extended to those faculty and staff members of Durham and Wake County Schools who assisted in the pretest of the instruments for this study. Finally, appreciation is due Mrs. Nancy Carpenter for her excellent preparation of the manuscript and to Mr. Willis Parker for design of the cover.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                                | Page |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| LIST OF TABLES . . . . .                                                       | iv   |
| CHAPTER                                                                        |      |
| I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .                                                      | 1    |
| Problem and Objectives . . . . .                                               | 3    |
| Definitions of Terms . . . . .                                                 | 3    |
| II. RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY . . . . .                                         | 5    |
| Theoretical Frame of Reference . . . . .                                       | 5    |
| Research Design and Method . . . . .                                           | 6    |
| Statistical Analyses . . . . .                                                 | 7    |
| III. ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA . . . . .                               | 8    |
| Comparison of Teacher-Principal Overall Attitudes<br>Toward Concepts . . . . . | 8    |
| Comparison of Selected Statements of Attitudinal<br>Inventory . . . . .        | 10   |
| Level of Teacher Acceptance of Selected Practices . . . . .                    | 14   |
| Relationship between Personal-Situational Factors<br>and Practices . . . . .   | 19   |
| Results of Teachers' Response to Question on<br>Future of Programs . . . . .   | 21   |
| IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .                           | 23   |
| V. SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .                                             | 27   |
| VI. APPENDICES . . . . .                                                       | 28   |
| Appendix A. Questionnaire, Concepts                                            |      |
| Appendix B. Questionnaire, Practices                                           |      |
| Appendix C. Teacher-Principal Evaluation of<br>Selected Concepts               |      |

# LIST OF TABLES

| Table                                                                                                                                                         | Page |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| 1. Comparison of Teachers-Principal Overall Attitudes Toward<br>Thirty-seven Concepts in a Program for the Disadvantaged . . .                                | 10   |
| 2. Distribution of Teachers by Adoption Levels Reached in<br>Acceptance of Thirty-six Practices . . . . .                                                     | 16   |
| 3. Percentage of Teachers Who Reached Adoption Level No. 4<br>on Each of Thirty-six Practices. . . . .                                                        | 17   |
| 4. Correlation Between Adoption of Practices and Personal-<br>Situational Factors of Sixty-five Teachers of Disadvantaged<br>Students . . . . .               | 20   |
| 5. Summary of Responses of Sixty-five Teachers to Question<br>on What They Felt was the Ultimate Answer to Better<br>Programs for the Disadvantaged . . . . . | 22   |

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

"There is much to be learned about educating students who are socially and economically deprived. The school system needs help with its task ..... Research and development efforts in education are expanding rapidly. It is essential to the improvement of classroom instruction to design a means of effectively disseminating the new knowledge that is being generated" (5, pp. 42-45).

This is a follow-up study to determine the attitudes and practices prevailing among participants some six months following the completion of an institute for teachers of the disadvantaged. It is in one sense an evaluation of the institute and at the same time, a search for additional knowledge of the value of certain concepts and practices in the real world in which teachers operate.

We live in a culture that is characterized by a multiplicity of innovative changes in societal concepts and processes. The ever-changing complexities of social, economic, educational, and political processes are creating constantly the need for improvement in the quantity and quality of education in our schools. These complexities have been compounded by advanced science and technology. These challenges have prompted our Congress to enact new policies to facilitate changes and redefine certain basic concepts. Congress, through the 1968 Amendments to the 1963 Vocational Education Act, recognized the need for strengthening vocational education programs, and redefined and expanded the availability of programs for disadvantaged and handicapped persons. The act also provided for creating new programs for this segment of our society. These actions remind us that man is simultaneously aware of the impact of change upon human conditions

and of the urgent need to improve these conditions through change. It is the public education system that is depended upon to provide the services to meet these needs of our society.

#### An Institute for Teachers of the Disadvantaged

North Carolina State University at Raleigh conducted in the summer of 1970 an Institute for Teachers of the Disadvantaged. It was a cooperative venture between the School of Education, Department of Agricultural Education and the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction. The institute was designed to provide inservice education for a group of teachers in North Carolina who had been for the previous year or more working specifically with disadvantaged students.

The primary purpose of the institute was to improve the professional abilities of the participants in the areas of: (1) identifying and understanding the disadvantaged pupil, (2) improving approaches for teaching the disadvantaged, and (3) assembling and developing appropriate teacher resources.

#### Will Concepts Become Practice?

During the institute, several participants indicated that they strongly agreed with many of the concepts stressed in the meetings, but had not given serious thought to putting them into effect. Many participants also pointed out that even though they agreed with certain concepts in teaching the disadvantaged, they wondered whether their local administrators would agree with them. After hearing such statements from the participants, it became a concern of the researchers to determine whether there was a difference between teachers' attitudes and their perception of their

administrators' views toward concepts and practices appropriate to a program for the disadvantaged.

The question was: How does the teacher perceive the attitude of his immediate superior or principal? Putting it another way, the objective was to identify the principal's projected attitude as the teacher sees it. The importance of the principal's projected attitude rests on the supposition that the teacher can only react to what he believes the principal's attitude to be; not to what the principal may feel to be his own, true viewpoint.

#### Problem and Objectives

The primary purpose of this study was to ascertain teacher attitudes toward certain concepts and practices in a program for the disadvantaged.

The specific objectives of this study were as follows:

1. To determine whether there was a difference between teachers' attitudes and their perception of their administrators' views toward concepts and practices in a program for the disadvantaged.
2. To determine the extent to which teachers adopted a group of selected practices in a program for the disadvantaged.
3. To determine the relationship between teacher adoption of selected practices and personal-situational factors.
4. To determine what teachers felt was the ultimate answer to better programs for the disadvantaged.

#### Definitions of Terms

The following basic terms are defined for this study:

Disadvantaged means persons who have academic or other handicaps resulting from socioeconomic or cultural impoverishment that prevent them from succeeding in regular vocational education programs designed for persons without such handicaps (7, p. 1).

Adoption process is the mental process through which an individual passes from first hearing about an innovation to final adoption. The process is one type of decision-making composed of stages or steps. In other words, the adoption of a specific practice is not the result of a single decision to act but of a series of actions and thought decisions (6, p. 76).

## CHAPTER II

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### Theoretical Frame of Reference

The importance of this study rests with the underlying assumptions: . . . First, there is a need to understand, predict, and, as appropriate, modify human behavior related to identifying and preparing the disadvantaged for employment opportunities. Second, teacher-administrator teamwork or cooperation is an important element in the development of an effective local occupational program for the disadvantaged. Third, the degree of cooperation made possible is affected by teacher-administrator's knowledge, understanding, and appreciation of the goals and processes of programs for the disadvantaged. Therefore, an analysis of teachers' viewpoints and their perception of their administrators' viewpoints would have implications for programs of pre-service and inservice education.

According to a study conducted in 1966 on a statewide basis (3), there was a considerable difference between teachers' expressed views and their perceptions of the viewpoints of their principals concerning 34 statements related to vocational education. But while there are numerous studies of attitudes of teachers and administrators, no studies were found in the area of the disadvantaged which attempted to measure administrator attitudes as the teacher "perceives" them.

### Research Design and Method

A two-part questionnaire was designed to facilitate data collection and analysis for this study. The first portion consisted of thirty-seven conceptual statements to secure data in the areas of (1) identifying and understanding the disadvantaged, and (2) utilizing certain approaches and resources for teaching the disadvantaged student (these statements were formed from general statements of the participants in the Institute Proceedings). Using a five-point, Likert-type attitudinal inventory (strongly agree to strongly disagree) teachers were asked first to indicate their own feelings or opinions toward each concept, and secondly, to indicate their opinion of the viewpoints of their administrator about these same items.

The second portion of the questionnaire consisted of thirty-six teaching practices. An adoption-level scale was used to measure the degree to which a teacher had accepted a particular practice (See P. 16). Question thirty-seven was an open-ended question that allowed a comprehensive response and was directly related to objective No. 4 of this study (p. 21).

The instrument was pretested for validity and reliability. The pretest was made with the assistance of eight teachers of the disadvantaged, four from Durham Public Schools and four from Raleigh - Wake County Public Schools. In addition, a critical evaluation of each question was made by two professors in the School of Education and two graduate students from the Departments of (1) Occupational Education and (2) Sociology at North Carolina State University.

Both students were former teachers of the disadvantaged. The recommendations of these individuals were used to make improvements in the instrument prior to its use in this study. Those interviewed in the pretest were not among those included in this study sample.

A total of 84 full-time secondary teachers of the disadvantaged were surveyed in this study. All of these teachers had participated in the three-week Institute for Teachers of the Disadvantaged, conducted by the School of Education, Department of Agricultural Education, at North Carolina State University during June 1970. Questionnaires were mailed to all 84 participants of the institute, and 65 (77.4%) of the 84 teachers returned questionnaires.

#### Statistical Analyses

The following statistical analyses were used to determine whether there were significant differences and/or relationships between means and variables.

1. Single sample one-tailed t-test - used to test the difference between teachers' views and their perception of their administrators' views.
2. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation - used to analyze relationship between teacher practices and personal-situational factors.
3. Mean values, frequency counts and percentages were used to analyze all data not treated statistically.

## CHAPTER III

### ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

The purpose of this study was first to determine whether there were differences between teachers' attitudes and their perception of their administrators' views toward concepts and practices in a program for the disadvantaged. Secondly, the study was intended to determine the level of teacher acceptance of a group of selected practices. A third purpose was to determine the relationship between personal-situational factors and teacher adoption of a group of selected practices. Finally, the researchers sought to determine what teachers felt was the ultimate answer to better programs for the disadvantaged.

#### Comparison of Teacher-Principal Overall Attitudes Toward Concepts

The attitudinal questionnaire consisted of thirty-seven statements, covering the areas of (1) identifying and understanding the disadvantaged, (2) methods and techniques, (3) curriculum planning, (4) guidance and counseling, and (5) providing teaching resources for the disadvantaged. Using a Likert-type five-point scale, teachers were asked to indicate their feelings about the statement and how they felt their immediate supervisor would feel about the same statement. Fourteen of the thirty-seven were stated in a positive format. The scores of negative items were reversed to facilitate all scores contributing to an average score. (See Appendix A for complete format and a summary of the teachers' responses to these statements).

There was a significant difference found between teachers' expressed views and their perceptions of their administrators' views toward concepts in a program for the disadvantaged. The data are presented in the following tables showing differences based on the schedule of 35 attitudinal statements as a whole and by selected items from the inventory.

Considering the inventory as a whole, teachers saw themselves slightly more favorable toward these concepts and practices in a program for the disadvantaged than they perceived their respective administrators (principals) to be. This is shown in Table I which exhibits an overall mean score of 3.015 by teachers for 37 statements of the inventory as compared to 2.902 perceived as their overall average score for their principals. Although the difference appears small, it was statistically significant at the .05 level of probability.

Table I also presents the percentage distribution of teachers' and principals' evaluation of 37 statements. It shows that 20 percent of teachers' responses as compared to 12 percent of principals' perceived views were categorized as "strongly agree". However, when the "strongly agree and agree" categories of responses were grouped, the margin for teachers was small (56 percent compared to 54 percent).

It appears that the difference shown in the overall score of teacher versus principal was primarily a result of the stronger feelings of teachers as noted by the larger percentage of teachers found in both top and bottom extremes of the five-point scale.

The viewpoints of both principals and teachers can be considered as highly positive attitudes. The fact that 54 percent of the teachers

viewed their administrators having favorable attitudes toward the concepts might be considered "very high" since administrators in general could not be expected to be as specialized in the area of the disadvantaged as the teachers.

Table I Distribution of Overall Attitude Scores of Teachers and Their Principals Toward Selected Concepts Related to Programs for the Disadvantaged as Seen by 65 Teachers, Spring 1971

|                                                         | Percentage by Levels of Agreement |       |           |          |                   | Mean Score* |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|-----------|----------|-------------------|-------------|
|                                                         | Strongly Agree                    | Agree | Uncertain | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |             |
| Teachers (Self-Concept) Viewpoints                      | 20                                | 36    | 10        | 23       | 11                | 3.015       |
| Principals' Viewpoints (as perceived by Teachers above) | 12                                | 42    | 18        | 22       | 6                 | 2.902       |

\* Averaged for 37 items  
Using 4-3-0-2-1 Scale;

N = 58 (Ave.)

\*t = (n-1) df.

4.35, significant at .05 level, 57 (n-1)df.

#### Comparison of Selected Statements of Attitudinal Inventory

As mentioned earlier in this study, the first portion of the attitudinal inventory consisted of thirty-seven statements of which fourteen were expected to be considered as negative items and twenty-three to elicit positive responses. The teachers generally agreed with all the "positive" statements except numbers 5, 10, and 11, while reporting that their principals would disagree only with No. 11.

These statements and a summary of the teacher-principal responses to them are presented in Appendix C.

For statements No. 5 and 10, the teacher-principal difference in viewpoints (as seen by the teachers) was very slight and both groups reported within the "uncertain" category.

In the case of item No. 11, the mean score of 1.85 on a 4-point scale indicates that teachers were definitely disagreeing with the concept that teaching the disadvantaged was not more difficult than teaching the regular students. Further, these teachers indicated they believed their principals felt the same as they but not as strongly.

|                                                                                               |            | %     | %        |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------|----------|
|                                                                                               |            | Agree | Disagree |
| Item 11 - Teaching the disadvantaged is no more difficult than teaching the non-disadvantaged | Teachers   | 19    | 79.4     |
|                                                                                               | Principals | 25.4  | 60.      |

In view of the above response, one could question the logic of classifying item 11 as a "positive" statement. However, the item was based on the premise that the disadvantaged student is not more difficult to teach if appropriate methods are utilized. A partial explanation of the negative responses by the teachers may be a lack of time and facilities to utilize the most appropriate methods, in which case effective teaching of the disadvantaged would be more difficult.

Teachers generally disagreed with all the "negative" statements in the inventory except Nos. 9 and 28 while reporting that their principals would disagree with items No. 9, 14, and 17.

|                                                                                                        |            | %     | %        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------|----------|
|                                                                                                        |            | Agree | Disagree |
| Item 9 - The learning style of the non-disadvantaged is more non-verbal than that of the disadvantaged | Teachers   | 53.2  | 35.5     |
|                                                                                                        | Principals | 54.7  | 32.1     |

The average score of 2.44 and 2.41 on item nine places it in the "uncertain" column by both teachers and principals. Perhaps the use of the double negative phrases (non-disadvantaged and non-verbal) in the same statement was a confusing combination to the respondents, even though this was not revealed in the pretesting of the instrument.

Item 28 was the second item intended to bring forth a negative response. It averaged 2.41 and also fell into the "uncertain" category. Actually, 16 teachers (26.7%) scored this item in the "uncertain" column, more than for any other item. It appears there must have been a lack of knowledge concerning this item.

| Item 28 - Most of the programmed material<br>now available for teaching the<br>disadvantaged is above the<br>student's understanding |            | %     | %        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------|----------|
|                                                                                                                                      |            | Agree | Disagree |
|                                                                                                                                      | Teachers   | 38.3  | 35.0     |
|                                                                                                                                      | Principals | 35.2  | 35.3     |

In reporting the principals' viewpoints, teachers saw them favoring the grouping of disadvantaged students into separate classes (item 14). Although over 21% of the teachers viewed their principals as "uncertain" about the concept, the largest percentage (47.3%) reported their principals to agree with the statement on grouping disadvantaged students.

| Item 14 - It is more feasible, for<br>teaching purposes, to group<br>or place the disadvantaged into<br>separate classes from the non-<br>disadvantaged |            | %     | %        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------|----------|
|                                                                                                                                                         |            | Agree | Disagree |
|                                                                                                                                                         | Teachers   | 38.7  | 53.3     |
|                                                                                                                                                         | Principals | 47.3  | 30.9     |

Finally, for the principals, teachers viewed them as "favoring a limited number of activities for the disadvantaged". On this statement (No. 17) about twice as many teachers as principals disagreed with the negatively stated item. One of the concepts emphasized during the

institute was the need for a wide variety of activities for the disadvantaged, and if teachers see their principals generally against this viewpoint, it could be a realistic barrier to improvements of their programs for the disadvantaged.

|                                                                                                                           |            | %     | %        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------|----------|
|                                                                                                                           |            | Agree | Disagree |
| Item 17 - Disadvantaged students should be limited to a small number of activities in achieving their objectives or goals | Teachers   | 32.8  | 57.4     |
|                                                                                                                           | Principals | 41.9  | 29.1     |
|                                                                                                                           |            |       |          |

It was interesting to note statements 33, 34, and 35. These statements concerned the school's overall guidance efforts with the disadvantaged, an area considered to be very important in the school system.

|                                                                               |            | %     | %        |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------|----------|
|                                                                               |            | Agree | Disagree |
| Item 33 - Most guidance counselors are oriented toward disadvantaged students | Teachers   | 9.5   | 85.7     |
|                                                                               | Principals | 16.7  | 68.5     |
|                                                                               |            |       |          |

|                                                                                      |            | %     | %        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------|----------|
|                                                                                      |            | Agree | Disagree |
| Item 34 - Many students who need to be in programs for the disadvantaged are omitted | Teachers   | 90.5  | 6.4      |
|                                                                                      | Principals | 75.0  | 10.7     |
|                                                                                      |            |       |          |

|                                                                                                      |            | %     | %        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-------|----------|
|                                                                                                      |            | Agree | Disagree |
| Item 35 - Many teachers of general education have little knowledge of the needs of the disadvantaged | Teachers   | 93.8  | 4.7      |
|                                                                                                      | Principals | 82.2  | 8.9      |
|                                                                                                      |            |       |          |

In item No. 33, a high percentage (86%) of the respondents appeared to feel that most guidance counselors are not oriented toward disadvantaged students. Even more interesting was the report that 94% of the teachers felt that many teachers of general education have little knowledge of the needs of the disadvantaged (item 35). Further, 82% of the teachers said they thought their administrators would agree with them on this item.

In addition, item 34 indicated that many students needing occupational education were not enrolled in it. These responses suggest that local programs for the disadvantaged could be improved if counselors and teachers of general education were more involved with occupational teachers in building programs for the disadvantaged. One logical procedure would be to include these persons in inservice workshops directed at programs for the disadvantaged.

In summary, 64 teachers responded to 37 concept statements relating to educational programs for the disadvantaged students, and averaged a score of 3.015 on a scale with 4.0 as top score. The teachers also reported that their principals would average 2.902 on the same items, a score which could be considered a very positive level of attitude. Of 37 conceptual statements, the teachers scored above 3.0 on 25 and above 3.2 on fourteen items. This response toward a series of concepts selected for importance in teaching disadvantaged students suggests that these teachers have exhibited highly desirable professional attitudes. It also suggests a high degree of satisfaction with the concepts emphasized in the inservice institute provided for them.

#### Level of Teacher Acceptance of Selected Practices

Objective Two: To determine the level of teacher acceptance of selected practices in a program for the disadvantaged.

The second portion of the questionnaire utilized the Bohlen, et al., and Rogers' Adoption Process Theory. These recognized authorities contend that adoption of any practice is a process with identifiable stages

generally classified as (1) awareness, (2) interest, (3) evaluation, (4) trial, and (5) adoption. Bea, Bohlen, et al.<sup>4</sup> have shown that the effectiveness of various communication media and change agents varies with the stage of adoption of the practice by the recipient. Therefore, a knowledge of the level of adoption may assist change agents in selecting the most appropriate means to encourage adoption of a practice. The following is an explanation of the scale as constructed for this study.

#### Adoption Level Scale

##### Statement

- This idea or practice is completely new to me; I have not heard of it before . . . . . 0 (New Idea)
- I am aware of this practice, but have not given it much attention. . . . . 1 (Aware)
- I am interested in the idea and am now in the process of seeking additional information about it . . . . . 2 (Interest)
- I have been evaluating the idea; and I am about ready to conclude that it does not apply to my present situation . . . . . 3 (Disfavor)
- I believe this practice has some merit, therefore, I plan to try it as soon as possible. . . . . 4 (Anticipate Trial)
- I am now in the process of trying out this practice . . . . . 5 (Trial)
- I am using this practice regularly . . . . . 6 (Adoption)

(See Appendix B for complete details of the schedule)

Positive or negative statements were constructed to relate to concepts emphasized in the workshop for these teachers of the disadvantaged. A summary of the teachers' overall acceptance of this group of practices is presented in Table II, based upon the teacher's individual average score of the thirty-six practices. A score range was established ranging from 0.0-6.0, from awareness to full adoption level.

Table II Distribution of Teachers by Adoption Levels Reached in Acceptance of Thirty-Six Practices

|         | Adoption Levels         |                             |                              |                                        |                         |                             | T<br>O<br>T<br>A<br>L |
|---------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
|         | I<br>Aware<br>(0.0-1.5) | II<br>Interest<br>(1.6-2.5) | III<br>Disfavor<br>(2.6-3.5) | IV<br>Anticipate<br>Trial<br>(3.6-4.5) | V<br>Trial<br>(4.6-5.5) | VI<br>Adoption<br>(5.6-6.0) |                       |
| Number  | 1                       | 1                           | 14                           | 22                                     | 26                      | 1                           | 65                    |
| Percent | 1.5                     | 1.5                         | 21.5                         | 34.0                                   | 40.0                    | 1.5                         | 100                   |

N-65

Combining the top adoption level categories (IV, V, VI), shows that more than three-fourths (75%) of the teachers reported a favorable attitude toward adoption of the thirty-six teaching practices. Nearly forty-two percent had reached the "trial" stage or higher.

It should also be noted that only one teacher reached the top adoption level category for the list of practices as a whole. Perhaps more important was the figure of 21.5% at level III, which represents those teachers who, although aware of the individual practices, have decided that they do not favor the list of practices on the whole.

Table III shows the percentage of teachers who reached at least stage IV (anticipate trial) for each of the thirty-six practices. It can be noted that 4 of the practices were accepted by 90 percent or more of the teachers. There were also eight more practices accepted by at least 80% of the teacher group.

TABLE III  
PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS WHO REACHED ADOPTION LEVEL IV  
ON EACH OF THIRTY-SIX PRACTICES

| <u>Practices</u>                                                            | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| I. Identifying the Disadvantaged Through:                                   |               |                |
| 1. Certain personality tests                                                | 19            | 33.3           |
| 2. Home visits and surveys                                                  | 54            | 83.0           |
| II. Overall Program Planning by:                                            |               |                |
| 3. Surveying local manpower needs                                           | 45            | 73.8           |
| 4. Meeting with parents to familiarize program                              | 41            | 66.1           |
| 5. Planning curriculum with other teachers                                  | 49            | 77.8           |
| 6. Using advisory council or committee                                      | 43            | 68.3           |
| 7. Planning time for seeking additional employment possibilities            | 46            | 76.7           |
| III. Approaches and Resources for Teaching                                  |               |                |
| 8. Individual instruction                                                   | 54            | 87.1           |
| 9. Utilizing small groups to take care of varying abilities and interests   | 58            | 93.5           |
| 10. Using more filmstrips and movies                                        | 57            | 90.5           |
| 11. Providing more field trips                                              | 51            | 82.3           |
| 12. Arranging classroom in conference style                                 | 52            | 85.2           |
| 13. Grouping students according to overall level of educational achievement | 30            | 49.2           |
| 14. Allowing student participation when setting up course objectives        | 42            | 66.7           |
| 15. Stating course objectives in behavioral terms                           | 43            | 72.9           |

Table III (Con't.)

| <u>Practices</u>                                                               | <u>Number</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 16. Carrying out cooperative work experience program                           | 40            | 65.6           |
| 17. Using programmed material                                                  | 44            | 72.1           |
| 18. Purchasing programmed material                                             | 39            | 63.9           |
| 19. Preparing programmed material                                              | 42            | 66.7           |
| 20. Improving communication through PTA and similar meetings                   | 38            | 61.3           |
| 21. Providing charts which visualize student progress                          | 41            | 66.1           |
| 22. Coordinating activities with programs outside of school                    | 48            | 76.2           |
| 23. Working more closely with guidance counselor                               | 59            | 93.7           |
| 24. Conducting night or day classes for parents                                | 14            | 23.0           |
| 25. Making report of program progress to administrators, teachers, and parents | 47            | 74.6           |
| 26. Using youth clubs or organizations to further meet student needs           | 42            | 68.9           |
| 27. Referring students you are unable to help                                  | 45            | 70.3           |
| 28. Having adequate time for student conferences                               | 46            | 73.0           |
| 29. Allowing students to choose courses                                        | 43            | 69.4           |
| 30. Keeping individual record on your students                                 | 61            | 95.3           |
| 31. Using more resource persons                                                | 53            | 84.1           |
| IV. Evaluation, involving:                                                     |               |                |
| 32. Teachers                                                                   | 44            | 69.8           |
| 33. Counselors                                                                 | 44            | 69.8           |
| 34. Administrators                                                             | 58            | 89.2           |
| 35. Students                                                                   | 55            | 85.9           |
| 36. A follow-up of your students                                               | 56            | 87.5           |

N = 65

\*Adoption level number 4 refers to upper level of evaluation stage or "anticipate trial".

The four most acceptable practices in order were: No. 30 - Keeping individual records of students; No. 23 - Working more closely with guidance counselors; No. 9 - Utilizing small groups to take care of varying abilities and interests; and No. 10 - Providing more film strips and movies.

In addition to the top four practices, these practices were accepted at adoption level IV (anticipate trial) by at least 80% of the teachers:

|        |                                                                            |         |
|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| No. 34 | Evolving administrators in evaluation of the program for the disadvantaged | - 89.0% |
| No. 36 | Evaluation involving a follow-up study of students                         | - 87.5% |
| No. 8  | Individualizing instruction                                                | - 87.1% |
| No. 35 | Evaluation which includes the students' opinions of the program            | - 85.9% |
| No. 12 | Arranging classroom in conference style                                    | - 85.2% |
| No. 31 | Using more resource persons                                                | - 84.1% |
| No. 2  | Identifying the disadvantaged thru home visits and surveys                 | - 83.0% |
| No. 11 | Providing more field trips                                                 | - 82.3% |

Despite the high acceptance of most practices listed in the survey, three practices were not accepted by the majority. The least acceptable of all practices was No. 24: "Conducting night or day classes for parents of the disadvantaged". Only 33% looked with favor on utilizing a personality test (item No. 1) with their students. Finally, practice No. 13, dealing with "grouping of students according to overall level of educational achievement" was acceptable to only 49% of the respondents.

#### Relationship Between Personal-Situational Factors and Practices

Objective Three: To determine the relationship between personal-situational factors and teacher adoption of selected practices.

From the professional literature and the experience of the researchers and their co-workers, it was determined that the following factors would be tested for a relationship to teacher adoption of the group of selected practices: (1) age; (2) professional degree held by teacher; (3) years of teaching experience with the disadvantaged; (4) grades taught; (5) location of school; (6) size and type of school.

The Kendall Nonparametric Rank Order Correlation Coefficient was used to determine relationships of factors to practice scores. Table IV shows the correlations found between these factors and practice scores. Of the seven variables studied, only two personal factors (age and professional degrees held by teachers) showed significant positive correlations to the total scores of teachers on thirty-six selected teaching practices. Even though no significant relationship was found between grades taught or location of school, it is interesting to note that a tendency toward positive correlation existed for each factor. The correlation favored those teaching 9-12 grades rather than only the grades 10-12, and those in urban schools.

Table IV also shows a slight negative correlation (not significant) between personal-situational factors (number of years of teaching the disadvantaged and size and type of school) and the practice scores. These findings indicate that the more experienced teachers with the disadvantaged and those in larger high schools tended to show less favorable overall adoption of the group of selected practices.

Table IV Correlation Between Adoption of Practice Scores  
and Personal-Situational Factors of  
Sixty-Five Teachers of Disadvantaged Students

| <u>Selected Factors</u>                        | <u>Correlation</u> |
|------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Age                                            | .2528*             |
| Degree (Qual.)                                 | .2373*             |
| Years of Teaching Exp. (with disadvantaged)    | -.0445             |
| Grades taught (9-12)                           | .1056              |
| Location of School (urban)                     | .0756              |
| Size of School (large)                         | -.0954             |
| Type of School (combination Jr-Sr High School) | -.0404             |

\*Significant at .05 level of probability, Kendall Nonparametric Rank Order Correlation Coefficients.

Results of Teachers' Responses to Question on Future of Programs  
for the Disadvantaged

Objective Four: To determine what teachers felt was the ultimate answer to better programs for the disadvantaged.

Question 37 of the second portion of the questionnaire was an open-ended question. Teachers were asked, "What do you think is the ultimate answer to better programs for the disadvantaged?" A summary of the responses to this question is presented in Table V.

Teacher responses shown in Table V indicate a wide variety of ways to better programs for the disadvantaged. But the major improvements suggested were that teachers needed (1) smaller classes, and (2) improved communication and better cooperation among administrators, parents, teachers, and local industry. The latter suggests that future local and/or state workshops, conferences, institutes, etc. should involve representatives of these groups as active participants.

Table V Summary of Responses of Sixty-Five Teachers  
To Question of What They Felt Was the Ultimate  
Answer to Better Programs for the Disadvantaged\*

| Outcome                                                                                                   | No. of Responses | % of Total Responses |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Teachers need smaller classes                                                                             | 34               | 28.0                 |
| Improved communication and better cooperation among administrators, parents, teachers, and local industry | 21               | 17.2                 |
| Dedicated teachers                                                                                        | 12               | 9.8                  |
| More inservice institutes                                                                                 | 12               | 9.8                  |
| Programmed or individual instruction                                                                      | 12               | 9.8                  |
| More emphasis on grouping                                                                                 | 9                | 7.4                  |
| Better prepared teachers                                                                                  | 6                | 4.9                  |
| More money for adequate facilities                                                                        | 6                | 4.9                  |
| Closer screening in selection of students                                                                 | 5                | 4.1                  |
| Better motivation techniques                                                                              | 3                | 2.5                  |
| Involvement of students in planning                                                                       | 2                | 1.6                  |

\*Twenty teachers either failed to respond to this question or their responses were not usable.

## CHAPTER IV

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This report presents the findings of a follow-up study of teacher attitudes and practices in school programs for the disadvantaged. The study focused upon 85 teachers in North Carolina who one year earlier had attended an institute for teachers of the disadvantaged.

The specific objectives of this study were (1) to determine whether there was a difference between teachers' attitudes and their perception of their administrators' viewpoints, (2) to determine the extent to which teachers adopted a group of selected practices in a program for the disadvantaged, (3) to determine the relationship between teacher adoption of practices and certain personal-situational factors, and (4) to determine what teachers felt was the ultimate answer to better programs for the disadvantaged.

### SUMMARY

The following findings were drawn from the data reported in this study:

#### Summary on Concepts

1. There was a small difference between teachers' attitudes and teachers' perceptions of their principals' attitudes toward selected concepts related to school programs for disadvantaged pupils. The difference was statistically significant at the .05 probability level ( $t=4.35$ ).
2. On the average, the teachers credited themselves and their principals with overall acceptance of the list of 37 concepts fostered during the Institute for the teachers. The mean score for teachers was 3.015 compared to 2.902 reported for their principals, on a 4 point scale with a score of 3.0 representing "agreement".

3. Fifteen of 37 items rated a mean score of 3.2 on a 4 point scale; three of these were above 3.52 on the scale.
4. The largest margin of difference between teacher and principal viewpoints appeared on item No. 13 where teachers strongly agreed on the needs for fewer and smaller classes of disadvantaged students per teacher but envisioned their principals with considerably less enthusiasm for this solution.
5. This group of mostly occupational education teachers indicated their belief that (1) teachers of general education had little knowledge of occupational education and the needs of disadvantaged students, and (2) most guidance counselors were not oriented toward the disadvantaged student. Further, they indicated that their principals would concur with them on these items.
6. These respondents were "undecided" on the question of whether teachers in general are cooperative in assisting with programs for the disadvantaged.

#### Summary of Teaching Practices

1. More than three-fourths of the teachers reported that on the whole they had reached at least stage IV (anticipate trial) in adoption of the list of 36 teaching practices.
2. Twenty percent of the teachers reached only stage III of the adoption scale which indicated on the whole a rejection of the list of practices.
3. Few of the teachers (33.3%) showed interest in using personality tests to help identify their students.
4. Few teachers (23%) reported interest in conducting day or night classes for parents of their students.
5. Age of teacher and level of professional degree showed significant positive correlation with teacher score on practices.
6. There was a tendency toward correlation between the variables of (a) grade-level taught, and (b) rural to urban location of school with total scores on practices, but the relationship was not statistically significant.
7. Slightly negative correlations were found between total scores of teachers on practices and (1) years of teaching the disadvantaged, (2) size of school, and (3) type of school.

Summary statement on what teachers felt was the ultimate answer to better programs for the disadvantaged.

Teacher responses indicated a wide variety of ways to improve programs for the disadvantaged. The major improvements suggested were that teachers needed (1) smaller classes, and (2) improved communication and better cooperation among administrators, parents, other teachers of general education, and local industry.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The teachers credited themselves and their principals with definitely positive attitudes toward selected concepts related to improved school programs for disadvantaged students.
2. Since 1.5 percent of the teachers reached the top adoption level category of teaching practices and 74.0 percent were in the "anticipate trial and trial stages", one can conclude that these teachers of the disadvantaged had favorable attitudes toward the list of recommended practices.
3. The teachers projected a strong belief that the curriculum for disadvantaged students should be occupationally oriented and include opportunities for work experience and an occupational youth club.
4. Teachers of the disadvantaged viewed general education teachers as lacking an adequate understanding of (1) occupational education and (2) the educational needs of their students; both needed to be of maximum assistance to the disadvantaged.
5. Many guidance counselors were not oriented toward the disadvantaged students.
6. There was apparently an overall lack of enthusiasm by both faculty and administration for programs for the disadvantaged.
7. Many disadvantaged students apparently sensed a lack of feeling that the school really wants to serve them.
8. Only "experience" and "professional degree" were teacher characteristics correlated with adoption level of selected teaching practices.
9. The primary suggestions, volunteered by the respondents, for improving the programs for the disadvantaged were that teachers needed (1) smaller classes, and (2) improved communication and better cooperation among administrators, parents, other teachers of general education, and local industry.

## IMPLICATIONS

It is the opinion of the writers that the following future actions would be justified on the basis of this study.

### For Preservice:

Teacher educators and students should be acquainted with the results of this study as one means of supporting their philosophy and anticipated activities in preparation for student teaching experiences.

### For Inservice:

1. Inservice programs for teachers of the disadvantaged should include as one of their objectives a means for bringing more closely together those teacher-administrator viewpoints that require mutual understanding for a successful local program.
2. Administrators should be a part of workshops for teachers of the disadvantaged in an effort to foster greater and a more mutual understanding among administrators and teachers.
3. Future local and/or state workshops, conferences, institutes, etc., for teachers of the disadvantaged; should involve more teachers of general education, school counselors, parents, representatives of industry, and students as active participants.

### For Research:

1. Studies should be conducted to determine the relationship between teacher-administrator viewpoints and specific areas of teaching the disadvantaged.
2. Additional studies should be designed to measure attitudes as perceptions of "relevant others" rather than as self-concepts of the experimental group involved.

#### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Glass, G. V. and J. C. Stanley, Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
2. Kerlinger, Fred N., Foundations of Behavioral Research: Educational and Psychological Inquiry, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
3. Miller, Texton R., Teacher Perception of Principals' Views on Vocational Education, Raleigh: North Carolina State University, Department of Agricultural Education
4. North Carolina Regional Publication No. 1, Agricultural Extension Service, How Farm People Accept New Ideas, Special Report No. 15, Ames, Iowa: Iowa State College, (November, 1955).
5. President National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, The People Left Behind, Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967.
6. Rogers, Everett M., Diffusions of Innovations: New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.
7. State Department of Public Instruction, Handbook for Evaluating Disadvantaged and Handicapped Students for Planning Occupational Education Programs, Raleigh, North Carolina: Division of Occupational Education, (February, 1970).

A P P E N D I C E S

A P P E N D I X   A

MARCH 15, 1971

North Carolina State University  
School of Education  
Department of Agricultural Education  
P. O. Box 5096  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Will there be a 1971 Institute for Teachers of the Disadvantaged?  
If so, will there be some changes in it? It depends partly on what you say!

Your cooperation is needed in helping us complete an evaluative study of the Institute for Teachers of Disadvantaged that was conducted last summer by the Division of Occupational Education, North Carolina State University, and in cooperation with the State Department of Public Instruction.

We feel that the three weeks of work were most profitable for those teachers who participated; however, to be sure that the approach used was a good one - and to insure adequate planning for future inservice and preservice training, we feel that further evaluation is needed.

The attached packet contains two instruments, including a brief description of each. Please read all the directions carefully, complete the instruments and return in the enclosed self-addressed envelope on or before March 31, 1971.

We appreciate the many demands upon your limited time during your educational program, but we feel that the relatively small amount of time required to complete these instruments will be of great benefit to the successful completion of research in education. We trust you will feel this contribution to be worthy of your participation.

Sincerely yours,

C. L. Strickland,  
Research Assistant

Dr. T. R. Miller, Director of  
1970 Institute and Associate  
Professor of Education, North  
Carolina State University

N. O. Warwick, Chief Consultant  
Programs for Disadvantaged and  
Handicapped, State Division of  
Occupational Education

PLEASE RETURN PRIOR TO:  
March 31, 1971

CONFIDENTIAL:

A FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF THE INSTITUTE FOR TEACHERS  
of the  
DISADVANTAGED

The following survey is divided into two sections, Attitudes Toward Concepts and Adoption of Practices. This information will be used in making plans for further development of programs for the disadvantaged.

Please respond to each statement as accurately and as honestly as possible. Also, keep in mind that each statement is geared toward your particular situation. The information that you give will be used exclusively for research purposes.

Thank you for your assistance in this research.

Section I

Attitudes Toward Concepts

First of all, we are greatly interested in your own feeling or opinions, and secondly, we are equally interested in how you see the viewpoints of your administrator about these same items.

We want to know these viewpoints about (1) identifying and understanding the disadvantaged student, and (2) certain approaches and resources for teaching the disadvantaged. You will agree with some of the statements, disagree with some, and be uncertain of others. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Likewise, your opinion of how your administrator sees these items is correct for you.

Please indicate your feelings as follows:

|             |                                                              |      |     |     |     |      |
|-------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|------|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Encircle A  | if you <u>agree</u> with the statement,<br>thus:             | SA   | (A) | U   | D   | SD   |
| Encircle SA | if you <u>strongly agree</u> with the<br>statement, thus:    | (SA) | A   | U   | D   | SD   |
| Encircle D  | if you <u>disagree</u> with the<br>statement, thus:          | SA   | A   | U   | (D) | SD   |
| Encircle SD | if you <u>strongly disagree</u> with<br>the statement, thus: | SA   | A   | U   | D   | (SD) |
| Encircle U  | if you are <u>uncertain</u> ,<br>thus:                       | SA   | A   | (U) | D   | SD   |

The following is an example of the way this schedule  
is arranged:

---

The disadvantaged student should be encouraged to graduate from  
high school or pass the General Educational Development Test.

SA (A) U D SD

Circling A (agree) indicates agreement with this statement.

---

Read each statement carefully and decide how you feel about it.  
If your feeling falls between two choices, select the one closer.

Circle the letters opposite teacher which indicate your feelings.

Circle the letters opposite principal which indicate your perception of his viewpoint.

SA = Strongly Agree

D = Disagree

U = Uncertain

A = Agree

SD = Strongly Disagree

- 
- |                                                                                                                                                                   |            |    |   |   |   |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Socioeconomic, educational, or cultural impoverishment often prevents the disadvantaged from succeeding in regular vocational programs.                        | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|                                                                                                                                                                   | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 2. Being able to identify the disadvantaged is important, however, having knowledge of the underlying causes is also important.                                   | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|                                                                                                                                                                   | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 3. Local administrators, in general, do not appear to be really concerned about programs for the disadvantaged.                                                   | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|                                                                                                                                                                   | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 4. Faculty members, in general, are rather cooperative in assisting with the program for the disadvantaged.                                                       | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|                                                                                                                                                                   | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 5. Disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students seem to have no unusual problems in their daily association.                                                      | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|                                                                                                                                                                   | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 6. Community organizations conducting programs for the disadvantaged are not usually willing to cooperate with the school program whenever and wherever they can. | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|                                                                                                                                                                   | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |

- |                                                                                                                                       |                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 7. Many disadvantaged students feel that they are not really wanted on the school campus.                                             | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                       | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 8. Teachers of the disadvantaged should find out the reading level and family background of their students.                           | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                       | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 9. The learning style of the non-disadvantaged is more non-verbal than that of the disadvantaged.                                     | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                       | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 10. Basically, the disadvantaged are against the goals and/or aspirations of the middle income class in society.                      | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                       | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 11. Teaching the disadvantaged is no more difficult than teaching the non-disadvantaged.                                              | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                       | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 12. The administration has a fairly good knowledge of occupational programs and the world of work.                                    | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                       | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 13. Teachers need fewer and smaller classes to better meet individual needs of disadvantaged students.                                | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                       | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 14. It is more feasible, for teaching purposes, to group or place the disadvantaged into separate classes from the non-disadvantaged. | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                       | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 15. The disadvantaged should be separated into classes from the emotionally and mentally handicapped.                                 | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                       | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 16. "Motivation" is more crucial in teaching the disadvantaged than all the other problems put together.                              | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                       | Principal: SA A U D SD |

- |                                                                                                                                                      |                        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 17. Disadvantaged students should be limited to a small number of activities in achieving their objectives or goals.                                 | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                                      | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 18. One of the best ways to reach the non-verbal student is to provide him with practical and concrete activities.                                   | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                                      | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 19. A Conference-type seating arrangement is less favorable for teaching the disadvantaged than the traditional classroom seating.                   | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                                      | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 20. Field trips and resource persons should be used more often with the non-disadvantaged than with disadvantaged students.                          | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                                      | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 21. Curriculum guides, syllabi, and textbooks should be used by the teacher merely as resources in adapting the course to the needs of the students. | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                                      | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 22. When setting up course objectives, students of the disadvantaged should be allowed to participate by selecting and suggesting objectives.        | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                                      | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 23. The curriculum for the disadvantaged should be occupationally oriented.                                                                          | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                                      | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 24. It is not really necessary to closely relate curriculum offerings and employment patterns for the disadvantaged.                                 | Teacher: SA A U D SD   |
|                                                                                                                                                      | Principal: SA A U D SD |
| 25. The objectives of a course for the disadvantaged need to be stated in behavioral terms unique to their situations.                               | Teachers: SA A U D SD  |
|                                                                                                                                                      | Principal: SA A U D SD |

|     |                                                                                                                                                             |            |    |   |   |   |    |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----|---|---|---|----|
| 26. | It is not very important that teachers of the disadvantaged have some knowledge of experiences common to their students, when setting up course objectives. | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|     |                                                                                                                                                             | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 27. | A well-rounded program for the disadvantaged should definitely include some cooperative work experiences.                                                   | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|     |                                                                                                                                                             | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 28. | Most of the programmed material now available for teaching the disadvantaged is above the student's understanding.                                          | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|     |                                                                                                                                                             | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 29. | Most of the materials needed for teaching the disadvantaged can not be prepared by the teacher, even if there were enough time.                             | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|     |                                                                                                                                                             | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 30. | Disadvantaged students should be assigned to programs rather than being allowed to choose their courses in occupational education.                          | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|     |                                                                                                                                                             | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 31. | Parents of the disadvantaged are much more willing to talk about their children's problems, than parents of the non-disadvantaged.                          | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|     |                                                                                                                                                             | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 32. | Families of the disadvantaged seldom talk to teachers concerning their children's progress.                                                                 | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|     |                                                                                                                                                             | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 33. | Most guidance counselors are oriented toward disadvantaged students.                                                                                        | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|     |                                                                                                                                                             | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 34. | Many students who need to be in programs for the disadvantaged are omitted.                                                                                 | Teacher:   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
|     |                                                                                                                                                             | Principal: | SA | A | U | D | SD |

35. Many teachers of general education have little knowledge of the needs of the disadvantaged.
36. Teachers of general education know very little about occupational education.
37. Youth organizations provide many opportunities for further meeting the socioeconomic, cultural, and educational needs of the disadvantaged.

Teacher: SA A U D SD

Principal: SA A U D SD

Teacher: SA A U D SD

Principal: SA A U D SD

Teacher: SA A U D SD

Principal: SA A U D SD

A P P E N D I X   B

1940-1941

44

## Section II

### Adoption of Practices

#### A. Introduction

The adoption process is the mental process through which an individual passes from first hearing about an innovation to final adoption. The process is one type of decision-making composed of stages or steps. In other words, the adoption of a specific practice is not the result of a single decision to act but of a series of actions and thought decisions.

The following adoption "Scale" is one way to measure the degree to which you have accepted a particular idea, practice, or principle.

#### B. Directions for Using the "Scale"

On the following attached sheet labeled "Adoption Level Scale," each statement is a description of one stage in the adoption process. In order, they are considered to be one step closer to the final action of complete acceptance of the idea, practice, or principal.

First: You should choose from the list the one (and only one) statement which best represents your present level of acceptance.

Secondly: Place your choice of level score on the sheet labeled "Teaching Practices" in the space provided. This should be done for each item on the list of practices.

-----  
 Tear off here for  
 convenience in using  
 (Do not return this sheet)

# Adoption Level Scale

| <u>Statement</u>                                                                                                                 | <u>Adoption Level Score</u> |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| This idea or practice<br>is completely new to me; I have<br>not heard of it before . . . . .                                     | 0                           |
| I am aware of this practice,<br>but have not given it much attention . . . . .                                                   | 1                           |
| I am interested in the idea and<br>now in the process of seeking additional<br>information about it . . . . .                    | 2                           |
| I have been evaluating the idea;<br>and I am about ready to conclude that it<br>does not apply to my present situation . . . . . | 3                           |
| I believe this practice has some<br>merit, therefore, I plan to try it as soon<br>as possible . . . . .                          | 4                           |
| I am now in the process of trying<br>out this practice . . . . .                                                                 | 5                           |
| I am using this practice regularly . . . . .                                                                                     | 6                           |

The following is an example of the way this schedule is  
arranged:

---

|                                                |          |
|------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Involving students in evaluating your program. | <u>6</u> |
|------------------------------------------------|----------|

Placing adoption level score "6" after the statement, indicates  
that you are using this practice regularly.

---

Section II Continued

Teaching Practices

Directions: Please score each of the following practices, using the preceding "adoption level scale", according to your present operation:

1. Using one or more of the following personality tests as a method to identify your students: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (a) Gordon Personnel Profile
  - (b) The Adjective Check List
  - (c) Behavior Preference Record
  - (d) Mooney Problem Check List
2. Using home visits and surveys to help you identify your students. \_\_\_\_\_
3. Involving administrators in evaluating your program. \_\_\_\_\_
4. Planning your curriculum in cooperation with other teachers in the school. \_\_\_\_\_
5. Keeping an accurate individual record on your students. \_\_\_\_\_
6. Coordinating activities with programs outside the school that work with the disadvantaged (e.g. local social services, community action, employment agency, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_
7. Involving students in evaluating your program. \_\_\_\_\_
8. Working more closely with the guidance counselor concerning problems of your students. \_\_\_\_\_
9. Using programmed materials in your instruction. \_\_\_\_\_
10. Holding meetings with parents of the disadvantaged to familiarize them with your program. \_\_\_\_\_
11. Using individualized instruction. \_\_\_\_\_
12. Using an advisory council or committee. \_\_\_\_\_
13. Utilizing small groups within your classes to take care of varying abilities and interests. \_\_\_\_\_

14. Grouping your students according to overall level of educational achievement. \_\_\_\_\_
15. Referring students you are unable to help to other programs in the school or outside the school. \_\_\_\_\_
16. Using more filmstrips and movies as teaching techniques. \_\_\_\_\_
17. Providing more field trips per year. \_\_\_\_\_
18. Making a follow-up on your students who have graduated or found gainful employment. \_\_\_\_\_
19. Arranging seats within classroom in conference style to provide a more favorable teaching atmosphere. \_\_\_\_\_
20. Using more resource persons to supplement instruction. \_\_\_\_\_
21. Involving other teachers (academic) in the evaluating process. \_\_\_\_\_
22. Allowing student participation when setting up course objectives. \_\_\_\_\_
23. Planning time for seeking additional employment possibilities for your students. \_\_\_\_\_
24. Making a survey of the local manpower requirements. \_\_\_\_\_
25. Stating course objectives similar to the following: \_\_\_\_\_
  - (a) To be able to differentiate between occupational plans and educational plans.
  - (b) To be able to name and describe different symbols in electricity.
26. Having adequate time for student conferences. \_\_\_\_\_
27. Carrying out a cooperative work experience program. \_\_\_\_\_
28. Purchasing programmed materials for your students. \_\_\_\_\_

29. Preparing programmed materials for your students. \_\_\_\_\_
30. Allowing students to choose their courses in occupational education. \_\_\_\_\_
31. Bringing about improved communication and understanding of your program through PTA and similar meetings. \_\_\_\_\_
32. Providing charts within the classroom which visualize student's progress. \_\_\_\_\_
33. Involving counselors in evaluating your program. \_\_\_\_\_
34. Making formal reports to local administrators, parents, and teachers of your program activities and progress. \_\_\_\_\_
35. Conducting night or day classes for disadvantaged parents. \_\_\_\_\_
36. Using youth organizations or clubs to further meet the socioeconomic, cultural, and educational needs of your students. \_\_\_\_\_

Briefly comment on the following question. (Do not use the Scale).

37. What do you think is the ultimate answer to better programs for the disadvantaged?

---



---



---



---

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Please check the appropriate items below that indicate your present situation.

Size of School: Less than 500\_\_\_; 500-800\_\_\_; 800-1,000\_\_\_;  
Over 1,000\_\_\_.

Junior High\_\_\_; Senior High\_\_\_; Junior & Senior High\_\_\_.

Location of School: Rural\_\_\_; Urban\_\_\_.

Grades Taught: 10th-12th\_\_\_; 9th-12th\_\_\_.

Age Last Birthday: 25-35\_\_\_; 36-46\_\_\_; 47-57\_\_\_; Over 57\_\_\_.

Sex: Male\_\_\_; Female\_\_\_.

Qualifications: Certificate\_\_\_; Bachelor's\_\_\_; Master's\_\_\_;  
Master's and hours beyond\_\_\_.

Years of teaching the Disadvantaged: (Write In)\_\_\_.

Thank you again for your assistance in this research.

APPENDIX C

PERCENT OF RESPONSES, MEAN VALUES AND FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION  
FOR TEACHERS' EVALUATION OF THIRTY-SEVEN STATEMENTS

| * T - Teacher<br>P - Principal (Teachers' Perception)                                                                                             | Strongly Agree<br>(4) | Frequency Distribution |                  |                 |        | Strongly Disagree<br>(1) | Mean     |              |        |             |              |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------|--------------------------|----------|--------------|--------|-------------|--------------|
|                                                                                                                                                   |                       | Agree<br>(3)           | Uncertain<br>(0) | Disagree<br>(2) |        |                          |          |              |        |             |              |
| Statements                                                                                                                                        | No. %                 | No. %                  | No. %            | No. %           | No. %  | No. %                    |          |              |        |             |              |
| 1. Socioeconomic, educational, or cultural impoverishment often prevents the disadvantaged from succeeding in regular vocational programs . . . . | T..17<br>P..12        | 26.6<br>21.4           | 41<br>40         | 64.1<br>71.4    | 2<br>2 | 3.1<br>3.6               | 2<br>2   | 3.1<br>3.19  |        |             |              |
| 2. Being able to identify the disadvantaged is important, however, having knowledge of the underlying causes is also important . . . . .          | T..41<br>P..19        | 64.1<br>35.2           | 23<br>32         | 35.9<br>59.3    | -<br>2 | -<br>3.7                 | -<br>1   | 3.64<br>3.35 |        |             |              |
| 3. Local administrators, in general, do not appear to be really concerned about programs for the disadvantaged . . . . .                          | T.. 8<br>P.. 3        | 12.7<br>5.6            | 15<br>10         | 23.8<br>18.5    | 3<br>7 | 4.8<br>13.0              | 32<br>28 | 50.8<br>51.9 | 5<br>6 | 7.9<br>11.1 | 2.57<br>2.79 |

| Statements                                                                                                                                                                | Frequency Distribution |      |              |      |                  |      |                 |      |                          |      | Mean |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------|--------------|------|------------------|------|-----------------|------|--------------------------|------|------|
|                                                                                                                                                                           | Strongly Agree<br>(4)  |      | Agree<br>(3) |      | Uncertain<br>(0) |      | Disagree<br>(2) |      | Strongly Disagree<br>(1) |      |      |
|                                                                                                                                                                           | No.                    | %    | No.          | %    | No.              | %    | No.             | %    | No.                      | %    |      |
| 4. Faculty members, in general, are rather cooperative in assisting with the program for the disadvantaged . . .                                                          | T.. 3                  | 4.7  | 27           | 42.2 | 13               | 20.3 | 14              | 21.9 | 7                        | 10.9 | 2.51 |
|                                                                                                                                                                           | P.. 2                  | 3.6  | 27           | 48.2 | 13               | 23.2 | 13              | 23.2 | 1                        | 1.8  | 2.70 |
| 5. Disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students seem to have no unusual problems in their daily association . .                                                           | T.. 4                  | 6.3  | 24           | 37.5 | 5                | 7.8  | 24              | 37.5 | 7                        | 10.9 | 2.42 |
|                                                                                                                                                                           | P.. 3                  | 5.5  | 25           | 45.5 | 8                | 14.5 | 15              | 27.3 | 4                        | 7.3  | 2.57 |
| 6. Community organizations conducting programs for the disadvantaged are not usually willing to cooperate with the school program whenever and wherever they can. . . . . | T.. 1                  | 1.6  | 11           | 18.0 | 11               | 18.0 | 31              | 50.8 | 7                        | 11.5 | 2.88 |
|                                                                                                                                                                           | P.. 1                  | 1.8  | 9            | 16.1 | 18               | 32.1 | 22              | 39.3 | 6                        | 10.7 | 2.87 |
| 7. Many disadvantaged students feel that they are not really wanted on the school campus . . . . .                                                                        | T.. 13                 | 20.6 | 32           | 50.8 | 5                | 7.9  | 13              | 20.6 | -                        | -    | 3.00 |
|                                                                                                                                                                           | P.. 7                  | 13.0 | 23           | 42.6 | 9                | 16.7 | 15              | 27.8 | -                        | -    | 2.82 |

| Statements                                                                                                               | Frequency Distribution |              |          |              |           |              |          |              |                   |              | Mean         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|----------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|
|                                                                                                                          | Strongly Agree         |              | Agree    |              | Uncertain |              | Disagree |              | Strongly Disagree |              |              |
|                                                                                                                          | No.                    | %            | No.      | %            | No.       | %            | No.      | %            | No.               | %            |              |
|                                                                                                                          | (4)                    |              | (3)      |              | (0)       |              | (2)      |              | (1)               |              |              |
| 8. Teachers of the disadvantaged should find out the reading level and family background of their students . . . . .     | T..33<br>P..18         | 52.4<br>34.0 | 27<br>29 | 42.9<br>54.7 | 2<br>3    | 3.2<br>5.7   | 1<br>3   | 1.6<br>5.7   | -<br>-            | -<br>-       | 3.52<br>3.30 |
| 9. The learning style of the non-disadvantaged is more non-verbal than that of the disadvantaged. . . . .                | T..6<br>P..5           | 9.7<br>9.4   | 27<br>24 | 43.5<br>45.3 | 7<br>7    | 11.3<br>13.2 | 14<br>10 | 22.6<br>18.9 | 8<br>7            | 12.9<br>13.2 | 2.44<br>2.41 |
| 10. Basically, the disadvantaged are against the goals and/or aspirations of the middle income class in society. . . . . | T..4<br>P..3           | 6.3<br>5.5   | 19<br>18 | 30.2<br>32.7 | 11<br>15  | 17.5<br>27.3 | 23<br>16 | 36.5<br>29.1 | 6<br>3            | 9.5<br>5.5   | 2.40<br>2.53 |
| 11. Teaching the disadvantaged is no more difficult than teaching the non-disadvantaged . . . . .                        | T..5<br>P..2           | 7.9<br>3.6   | 7<br>12  | 11.1<br>21.8 | 1<br>8    | 1.6<br>14.5  | 24<br>19 | 38.1<br>34.5 | 26<br>14          | 41.3<br>25.5 | 1.85<br>2.04 |

| Statements                                                                                                                                     | Frequency Distribution |      |              |      |                  |      |                 |      |                          |      | Mean |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------|--------------|------|------------------|------|-----------------|------|--------------------------|------|------|
|                                                                                                                                                | Strongly Agree<br>(4)  |      | Agree<br>(3) |      | Uncertain<br>(0) |      | Disagree<br>(2) |      | Strongly Disagree<br>(1) |      |      |
|                                                                                                                                                | No.                    | %    | No.          | %    | No.              | %    | No.             | %    | No.                      | %    |      |
| 12. The administration has a fairly good knowledge of occupational programs and the world of work . . . .                                      | T.. 9                  | 14.5 | 27           | 43.5 | 6                | 9.7  | 16              | 25.8 | 4                        | 6.5  | 2.73 |
|                                                                                                                                                | P.. 8                  | 15.1 | 31           | 58.5 | 7                | 13.2 | 6               | 11.3 | 1                        | 1.9  | 3.00 |
| 13. Teachers need fewer and smaller classes to better meet individual needs of disadvantaged students . . . . .                                | T..43                  | 68.3 | 17           | 27.0 | -                | -    | 1               | 1.6  | 2                        | 3.2  | 3.60 |
|                                                                                                                                                | P..18                  | 32.7 | 24           | 43.6 | 4                | 7.3  | 7               | 12.7 | 2                        | 3.6  | 3.14 |
| 14. It is more feasible, for teaching purposes, to group or place the disadvantaged into separate classes from the non-disadvantaged . . . . . | T.. 6                  | 9.7  | 18           | 29.0 | 5                | 8.1  | 21              | 33.9 | 12                       | 19.4 | 2.68 |
|                                                                                                                                                | P.. 6                  | 10.9 | 20           | 36.4 | 12               | 21.8 | 13              | 23.6 | 4                        | 7.3  | 2.35 |
| 15. The disadvantaged should be separated into classes from the emotionally and mentally handicapped. . . . .                                  | T..19                  | 30.2 | 30           | 47.6 | 7                | 11.1 | 6               | 9.5  | 1                        | 1.6  | 3.20 |
|                                                                                                                                                | P.. 8                  | 14.8 | 31           | 57.4 | 9                | 16.7 | 5               | 9.3  | 1                        | 1.9  | 3.02 |

55

| Statements                                                                                                                                  | Frequency Distribution |              |              |              |                  |              |                 |              |                          |              | Mean |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|------|
|                                                                                                                                             | Strongly Agree<br>(4)  |              | Agree<br>(3) |              | Uncertain<br>(0) |              | Disagree<br>(2) |              | Strongly Disagree<br>(1) |              |      |
|                                                                                                                                             | No.                    | %            | No.          | %            | No.              | %            | No.             | %            | No.                      | %            |      |
| 16. "Motivation" is more crucial in teaching the disadvantaged than all other problems put together . . .                                   | T..26<br>P..12         | 40.6<br>21.8 | 27<br>30     | 42.2<br>54.5 | 6<br>8           | 9.4<br>14.5  | 5<br>5          | 7.8<br>9.1   | -<br>-                   | 3.36<br>3.15 |      |
| 17. Disadvantaged students should be limited to a small number of activities in achieving their objectives or goals . . . . .               | T..3<br>P..3           | 4.9<br>5.5   | 17<br>20     | 27.9<br>36.4 | 6<br>16          | 9.8<br>29.1  | 27<br>12        | 44.3<br>21.8 | 8<br>4                   | 2.73<br>2.44 |      |
| 18. One of the best ways to reach the non-verbal student is to provide him with practical and concrete activities . . . . .                 | T..18<br>P..13         | 28.6<br>23.6 | 43<br>38     | 68.3<br>69.1 | 1<br>3           | 1.6<br>5.5   | -<br>1          | 1.8          | 1<br>-                   | 3.26<br>3.23 |      |
| 19. A conference-type seating arrangement is less favorable for teaching the disadvantaged than the traditional classroom seating . . . . . | T..1<br>P..1           | 1.6<br>1.9   | 7<br>13      | 11.3<br>24.1 | 9<br>17          | 14.5<br>31.5 | 35<br>22        | 56.5<br>40.7 | 10<br>1                  | 3.02<br>2.62 |      |

| Statements                                                                                                                                                    | Frequency Distribution |              |          |              |         |                  |          |                 |         |                          | Mean         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|----------|--------------|---------|------------------|----------|-----------------|---------|--------------------------|--------------|
|                                                                                                                                                               | Strongly Agree<br>(4)  | Agree<br>(3) |          |              |         | Uncertain<br>(0) |          | Disagree<br>(2) |         | Strongly Disagree<br>(1) |              |
|                                                                                                                                                               |                        | No.          | %        | No.          | %       | No.              | %        | No.             | %       |                          |              |
| 20. Field trips and resource persons should be used more often with the non-disadvantaged than with disadvantaged students . . . . .                          | T.. 4<br>P.. 2         | 6.3<br>3.7   | 9<br>10  | 14.3<br>18.5 | 6<br>8  | 9.5<br>14.8      | 25<br>25 | 39.7<br>46.3    | 19<br>9 | 30.2<br>16.7             | 3.04<br>2.89 |
| 21. Curriculum guides, syllabi, and textbooks should be used by the teacher merely as resources in adapting the course to the needs of the students . . . . . | T.. 20<br>P.. 8        | 31.7<br>14.8 | 34<br>37 | 54.0<br>68.5 | 3<br>2  | 4.8<br>3.7       | 4<br>6   | 6.3<br>11.1     | 2<br>1  | 3.2<br>1.9               | 3.20<br>3.00 |
| 22. When setting up course objectives, disadvantaged students should be allowed to participate by selecting and suggesting objectives . . . . .               | T.. 13<br>P.. 6        | 20.6<br>11.1 | 36<br>29 | 57.6<br>53.7 | 8<br>10 | 12.7<br>18.5     | 5<br>6   | 7.9<br>11.1     | 1<br>3  | 1.6<br>5.6               | 3.11<br>2.86 |
| 23. The curriculum for the disadvantaged should be occupationally oriented . . . . .                                                                          | T.. 13<br>P.. 10       | 21.0<br>18.5 | 30<br>32 | 48.4<br>59.3 | 9<br>9  | 14.5<br>16.7     | 8<br>2   | 12.9<br>3.7     | 2<br>1  | 3.2<br>1.9               | 3.02<br>3.13 |

| Statements                                                                                                                                                         | Frequency Distribution |              |           |              |               |              |              |              |                       |              |     |   | Mean         |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----|---|--------------|
|                                                                                                                                                                    | Strongly Agree (4)     |              | Agree (3) |              | Uncertain (0) |              | Disagree (2) |              | Strongly Disagree (1) |              | No. | % |              |
|                                                                                                                                                                    | No.                    | %            | No.       | %            | No.           | %            | No.          | %            | No.                   | %            |     |   |              |
| 24. It is not really necessary to closely relate curriculum offerings and employment patterns for the disadvantaged . . . . .                                      | T.. 3<br>P.. -         | 4.8          | 3<br>6    | 4.8<br>11.1  | 4<br>10       | 6.5<br>18.5  | 38<br>28     | 61.3<br>51.9 | 14<br>10              | 22.6<br>18.5 |     |   | 3.09<br>3.09 |
| 25. The objectives of a course for the disadvantaged need to be stated in behavioral terms unique to their situations. . . . .                                     | T.. 9<br>P.. 5         | 14.3<br>9.3  | 48<br>36  | 76.2<br>66.7 | 3<br>10       | 4.8<br>18.5  | 2<br>2       | 3.2<br>3.7   | 1<br>1                | 1.6<br>1.9   |     |   | 3.08<br>3.02 |
| 26. It is not very important that teachers of the disadvantaged have some knowledge of experiences common to their students, when setting up course objectives . . | T.. 4<br>P.. 3         | 6.3<br>5.5   | 4<br>6    | 6.3<br>10.9  | -<br>5        | 9.1          | 22<br>26     | 34.9<br>47.3 | 33<br>15              | 52.4<br>27.3 |     |   | 3.33<br>3.06 |
| 27. A well-rounded program for the disadvantaged should definitely include some cooperative work experiences . . . . .                                             | T.. 20<br>P.. 8        | 32.3<br>14.8 | 31<br>33  | 50.0<br>61.1 | 8<br>10       | 12.9<br>18.5 | 2<br>1       | 3.2<br>1.9   | 1<br>2                | 1.6<br>3.7   |     |   | 3.30<br>3.07 |

| Statements                                                                                                                                      | Frequency Distribution |              |                  |              |          |                 |          |                          |          |              | Mean         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|----------|-----------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|
|                                                                                                                                                 | Strongly Agree<br>(4)  | Agree<br>(3) | Uncertain<br>(0) |              |          | Disagree<br>(2) |          | Strongly Disagree<br>(1) |          |              |              |
|                                                                                                                                                 |                        |              | No.              | %            | No.      | %               | No.      |                          |          | %            |              |
| 28. Most of the programmed material now available for teaching the disadvantaged is above the student's understanding . . . . .                 | T.. 5<br>P.. 2         | 8.3<br>3.7   | 18<br>17         | 30.0<br>31.5 | 16<br>16 | 26.7<br>29.6    | 19<br>15 | 31.7<br>27.8             | 2<br>4   | 3.3<br>7.4   | 2.41<br>2.55 |
| 29. Most of the materials needed for teaching the disadvantaged cannot be prepared by the teacher, even if there were enough time . . . . .     | T.. 1<br>P.. 1         | 1.6<br>1.9   | 12<br>9          | 19.0<br>16.7 | 3<br>6   | 4.8<br>11.1     | 35<br>29 | 55.6<br>53.7             | 12<br>9  | 19.0<br>16.7 | 2.97<br>2.96 |
| 30. Disadvantaged students should be assigned to programs rather than being allowed to choose their courses in occupational education . . . . . | T.. -<br>P.. 1         | 1.8          | 4<br>11          | 6.5<br>19.6  | 7<br>12  | 11.3<br>21.4    | 33<br>24 | 53.2<br>42.9             | 18<br>8  | 29.0<br>14.3 | 3.25<br>2.89 |
| 31. Parents of the disadvantaged are much more willing to talk about their children's problems, than parents of the non-disadvantaged . . . . . | T.. 2<br>P.. -         | 3.3          | 4<br>9           | 6.7<br>18.8  | 8<br>4   | 13.3<br>8.3     | 27<br>25 | 45.0<br>52.1             | 19<br>10 | 31.7<br>20.8 | 3.21<br>3.02 |

| Statements                                                                                               | Frequency Distribution |              |                  |                 |                          |             |            |              | Mean       |              |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
|                                                                                                          | Strongly Agree<br>(4)  | Agree<br>(3) | Uncertain<br>(0) | Disagree<br>(2) | Strongly Disagree<br>(1) | No.         | %          | No.          |            | %            |
| 32. Families of the disadvantaged seldom talk to teachers concerning their children's progress . . . . . | T..14<br>P.. 8         | 22.2<br>14.8 | 43<br>39         | 68.3<br>72.2    | -<br>2                   | 4<br>3      | 6.3<br>5.6 | 2<br>2       | 3.2<br>3.7 | 3.10<br>3.02 |
| 33. Most guidance counselors are oriented toward disadvantaged students . . . . .                        | T.. -<br>P.. 1         | 1.9          | 6<br>8           | 9.5<br>14.8     | 3<br>8                   | 4.8<br>14.8 | 31<br>31   | 49.2<br>57.4 | 23<br>6    | 36.5<br>11.1 |
| 34. Many students who need to be in programs for the disadvantaged are omitted . . . . .                 | T..17<br>P.. 9         | 27.0<br>16.1 | 40<br>33         | 63.5<br>58.9    | 2<br>8                   | 3.2<br>14.3 | 2<br>5     | 3.2<br>8.9   | 2<br>1     | 3.18<br>3.04 |
| 35. Many teachers of general education have little knowledge of the needs of the disadvantaged . . . . . | T..30<br>P..15         | 46.9<br>26.8 | 30<br>31         | 46.9<br>55.4    | 1<br>5                   | 1.6<br>8.9  | 2<br>4     | 3.1<br>7.1   | 1<br>1     | 1.6<br>1.8   |

| Statements                                                                                                                                              | Frequency Distribution |              |                  |                 |                          |     |      |     | Mean |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----|------|-----|------|
|                                                                                                                                                         | Strongly Agree<br>(4)  | Agree<br>(3) | Uncertain<br>(0) | Disagree<br>(2) | Strongly Disagree<br>(1) | No. | %    | No. |      |
| 36. Teachers of general education know very little about occupational education . . . . .                                                               | 42.2                   | 50.0         | 3                | 4.7             | -                        | 32  | 50.0 | 2   | 3.38 |
|                                                                                                                                                         | T..27                  |              | 8                | 14.5            | 3                        | 30  | 54.5 | 2   | 3.11 |
|                                                                                                                                                         | P..12                  |              |                  |                 |                          |     |      |     |      |
| 37. Youth organizations provide many opportunities for further meeting the socioeconomic, cultural and educational needs of the disadvantaged . . . . . | 31.3                   | 50.0         | 4                | 6.3             | 5                        | 32  | 50.0 | 3   | 3.15 |
|                                                                                                                                                         | T..20                  |              | 8                | 14.8            | 4                        | 32  | 59.3 | 1   | 3.07 |
|                                                                                                                                                         | P..9                   |              |                  |                 |                          |     |      |     |      |